DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 140 CE 001 571

AUTHOR Glancy, Keith E.
TITLE Continuing Education Unit: Three Pilot Project Reports, September 1970 to June 1971.
INSTITUTION National Univ. Extension Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 70
NOTE 16p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Education; *Adult Education Programs; Adult Educators; *Noncredit Courses; *Pilot Projects; Post Secondary Education; Program Development; Program Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Continuing Education Unit

ABSTRACT

This three-part document presents material regarding Continuing Education Unit (CEU) pilot projects. The first contains a memorandum to CEU pilot project coordinators, a report form, and special instructions. The second, a National University Extension Association report, defines the CEU as "ten contact hours of participation in an organized continuing education experience under responsible sponsoring, capable direction and qualified instruction." It offers recommendations to the National Task Force and a four-item bibliography. The third presents excerpts from pilot project evaluation reports; selected questionnaire responses dealing with CEU acceptance, operational problems, deficiencies, recommendations for the future, and general comments. Included is a three-page report presenting statistical information related to CEU programs in thirteen participating institutions. (MW)

ED 089140

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSOCIATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
SUITE 360
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

September 3, 1970

TELEPHONE
OFFICE (202) 659-3220

MEMORANDUM

To: Pilot Project Coordinators, Continuing Education Unit

From: Keith E. Glancy, National Task Force

Subject: Pilot Project Information

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Attached is a copy of the pilot project report form as revised on the basis of our July meeting and subsequent discussions. Also enclosed is a brief explanation of the information which should be included on this report. A report form should be completed on each noncredit activity for which c.e. units are awarded, except for repeated programs.

Reports should be sent at the end of each month to the NUEA Washington Office at the above address. The first report should be sent at the end of October. It is not critical that each set of reports covers exactly a month, so any that come to you late can be included with the next month's report. We are interested in getting a continuous supply to analyze rather than one enormous stack.

If you find it necessary to eliminate some activities because of the volume involved, remember that the Task Force is most interested in obtaining information on the application of the c.e. unit to the widest possible variety of programs. Please make your selections accordingly.

In addition to this report on each activity, we expect to include in our evaluation procedure the following steps:

a. A short reactor form to go to a small sample of individual participants.

b. Reports on a sample of activities at each institution for which c.e. units were not awarded.

c. A summary questionnaire which will go to each pilot project coordinator next spring after some experience with the c.e. unit.

d. A meeting of representatives of the participating pilot projects with the Task Force late in the 1970-71 school year to evaluate the information received from the above three sources and the reports, and to suggest changes in or additions to the criteria for the c.e. unit.

Additional information on these steps will be supplied as details become available.

Your cooperation and objective evaluation is indispensable to an accurate assessment of the potential application of the c.e. unit. The Task Force is very pleased that you have expressed a willingness to participate in the pilot project.

Attachments

CE 001571

CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT

Pilot Project Report

Title of Activity _____
(additional description of program may be given on back of report.)

Format (Class, short course, conference, etc.) _____

Equivalent Educational Level of Instruction:

a. ____ Secondary school level -- introductory trade and vocational, job-entry, remedial, and skill training.
b. ____ Junior college level -- technical-terminal, basic technology, aide, paraprofessional, supervision, liberal adult education.
c. ____ Senior college level -- advanced technology, pre-professional, professional refresher, current state-of-the-art, management technology.
d. ____ Post-baccalaureate level -- continuing professional education, research assessment, administration, graduate equivalent.
e. ____ Other. Designate level. _____

Schedule (dates and hours) _____

Instructional hours _____ No. of c.e. units awarded _____

Initial enrollment _____ No. qualifying for c.e. units _____

Accumulated c.e. units (units awarded x participants) _____

Minimum educational background expected of participants _____

Program director: Title: _____

Institution: _____

Primary Instructor: Title: _____
Institution or Organization: _____

Number of additional instructors involved _____

Additional times this activity will be offered ____ Estimated attendance ____

Cooperating or cosponsoring organization _____

NOTE: Use back for comments and explanations.
Attach program announcement, course description, outline or schedule.

Reported by _____ Date _____

Institution _____

COMMENTS AND EXPLANATIONS: Include any or all of the following items as appropriate:

a. Additional description of activity.
b. Reactions of participants to c.e. units.
c. Reactions of cosponsors or program planners to c.e. units.
d. Administrative problems encountered.
e. Difficulties experienced in applying criteria to this activity.
f. Reactions of continuing education staff to use of c.e. unit.
g. Suggestions for restating criteria.
h. Any other pertinent information.

Return to: National University Extension Association
Suite 360
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D. C. 20036

CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT

Special Instructions to Pilot Projects

General

1. Reports from each institution should be submitted by or through the pilot project coordinator. Reports should be submitted at the end of each month beginning in October. The attached report should be duplicated by each institution in the quantity needed.

2. A report should be prepared on each activity for which c.e. units are awarded. Activities which are repeated during the school year do not need to be reported more than once. Indicate on the first report the number of times the program will be repeated and estimate the attendance for the additional sections.

3. Programs may be included in the report even though not under the direct administration of the extension division. Reports should be submitted together, however, and the same information is required.

4. While it is anticipated that permanent records can be maintained by the institutions involved in the pilot projects, each institution must meet its own administrative requirements. The Task Force will want to sample the reaction of the students who were informed that c.e. units were awarded to obtain their reactions to the system. Please let us know if they are not so informed.

Pilot Project Reports

The following information may clarify some of the questions you have when completing the reports.

Title of Activity: Use the title as advertised or published. You may add any other designation you use such as course or activity number. In addition, you may wish to use the back of the blank to expand on the title to make clear the type of program being presented. This may also be clarified by the brochure or course schedule attached.

Format: Use the designation you ordinarily use for this activity.

Equivalent Level of Instruction: Descriptions of level are meant to be indications, not limitations. If the activity does not fit one of the four categories given, use the "other" category and give the designation of level as you feel it should be stated.

Schedule: Provide sufficient information so the schedule is clear. (e.g., 7-9:30 each Thursday night for 12 weeks starting Oct. 15, or, 9:00 a.m. Sat. to 4:00 p.m. Sun. for four weekends beginning Nov. 7.)

Instructional Hours: Enter the number of contact hours or equivalent which you allow for the program, not including any noninstructional activities, such as organizational business meetings, scheduled recreational or social activities, or similar items.

No. of c.e. units Awarded: Enter the number of units which are awarded and included on the permanent record of each participant for satisfactory completion of the activity.

Initial Enrollment: The number completing the official enrollment for the activity.

No. Qualifying for c.e. units: The number of participants included on the final report and approved by the program director to be awarded c.e. units.

Accumulated c.e. units: The total units for the activity are determined by multiplying the number of units awarded each participant by the number of participants who complete the program.

Minimum Educational Background Expected of Participants: To be answered only when a specific background is either directly stated or implicitly understood by the planners of the program. Otherwise the answer should be "none."

Program Director: Please indicate the title of the person responsible for determining or organizing the program content. Indicate whether or not he is a member of your institutional staff or from another institution or organization.

Primary Instructor: The person taking responsibility for the execution of the educational program may be the program director, or may be an instructor assigned to the activity. Again, indicate whether he is a member of your institutional staff or from another organization.

No. of Additional Instructors Involved: Include those individuals who make a presentation or significant contribution to the instruction of the group. Panel members with prepared statements should be included.

Additional Times This Program Will Be Offered: If the same program is scheduled to be offered without significant alteration at other times or at other locations during the school year, indicate the number of additional sections which will be operated. Individual reports on each repeat performance will not then be necessary.

Estimated Attendance: Estimate the attendance for the additional scheduled programs. It is assumed that participants in each of the sections will be awarded c.e. units. If not, the additional sections should not be included in the report.

Cooperating or Cosponsoring Organization: Give the name of the association, society, or other organization which assisted your institution with the program planning. Departments or organizations which are units of your university are not to be included.

Comments and Explanations: Please give the Task Force the benefit of your experience in awarding c.e. units to individual activities. If you have either favorable or unfavorable reactions from the students, the cosponsoring agency, or your own staff, such information will be helpful. Note also any difficulty encountered in determining the number of units and indicate the final solution and its rationale.

Brochures or Outlines: Attach a copy of the material which best describes the content of the program. If listed in a catalog of classes, one copy will be sufficient and may be referred to on each of the report forms.

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSOCIATION

The Continuing Education Unit --

Pilot Project Report

TEN CONTACT HOURS OF PARTICIPATION IN AN ORGANIZED CONTINUING EDUCATION EXPERIENCE UNDER RESPONSIBLE SPONSORSHIP, CAPABLE DIRECTION AND QUALIFIED INSTRUCTION

After two years discussion, the National Task Force agreed on the above definition of a continuing education unit. The members spent many sessions analyzing the problems which might be encountered in the application of the c.e. unit, but it soon became obvious that field testing of the proposed unit would be needed to provide many of the answers.

In May, 1970, the members of the Executive Committee of the Conferences and Institutes Division of the National University Extension Association were asked if they would be interested in participating in a pilot project on the application of the c.e. unit. The response was enthusiastic and most of the members of the committee indicated that their institutions would be willing to participate. With this nucleus and a few others who heard about the pilot project, an orientation meeting involving twenty-one institutions was called in July, 1970, in Washington. Of those institutions represented, fourteen were ultimately able to cooperate in applying the c.e. unit during the 1970-71 school year and submitting reports on those activities to which the units were applied. A summary of the information contained in these reports and reported at the NUEA Annual Conference in Portland in May is attached.

This sampling of over 600 activities involving more than 28,000 individuals provides a fair sample of the major types of continuing education programs offered by universities: classes, intensive courses, workshops and conferences. In addition, a few less universal types were also sampled: correspondence courses, lecture series, and living room seminars.

Applications of the c.e. unit were consistent and uniform for evening classes and for intensive courses. Some inconsistency and minor difficulty were apparent when applying the criteria to conference programs and to the few correspondence courses reported. Much of this inconsistency must be laid to inadequate orientation of the individuals involved, often not the same person coordinating the pilot project. There was some sentiment to question the assignment of units to "every little event."

The major problem noted in the pilot projects was that of determining individual attendance and thus determining which individuals should be awarded c.e. units. No helpful or practical solutions were forthcoming to solve the problem, but it was generally agreed that there were inherent dangers, especially of diluting the value of the c.e. unit, in awarding units without adequate

information about the participation by the individual participants. More emphasis should be placed on "satisfactory completion" of an activity, even though this may entail only attendance at the various sessions.

No single pattern was evident for the development of permanent records at the participating institutions. In some institutions it was difficult to obtain full cooperation of the registrar; in others the problems were resolved. A special effort was made by the University of Missouri-Rolla to develop a computer program. It was placed in operation during the spring of 1971 and offers a model for others wishing to develop computer based records. It is capable of printing out the record of an individual including a brief description of each of the courses on his record. Dean Ed Lorey can supply details on the program and the system.

Except for the permanent records, no serious administrative problems were reported. The social security number caused some difficulty, either in obtaining it from the student or in including it in the permanent records where the present system does not provide for it.

The reactions of students were sampled on an informal basis in most pilot projects, but at the University of New Hampshire Carmita Murphy asked the students to complete a questionnaire reacting to the c.e. unit. Eighty-five percent agreed that "I am interested in having my participation in a noncredit course or program recorded by the c.e. unit system." Excerpts from the comments made by the students are included at the end of the report.

Most participants felt that the c.e. unit had great potential which could only be realized when it was accepted much more widely, especially by industry and by professional and technical societies. We are now selling an idea for which we have not yet created a demand. While a few participants were cautious and wanted to wait for further results, no one expressed a desire to scrap the idea. The c.e. unit met with general acceptance which can be considered a significant accomplishment since it was applied by people and to people who had a limited opportunity to understand and evaluate the concept.

From the information provided in the pilot project reports and from the discussions at the NUEA Annual Meeting in Portland, the following recommendations are being presented to the National Task Force for consideration.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE NATIONAL TASK FORCE

A. The summary of operating procedures distributed by the National Task Force to institutions and organizations initiating the application of the c.e. unit should include statements which:

1. Emphasize the necessity for having some basis for determining "satisfactory completion" of the continuing education activity. The determination of satisfactory individual attendance in many programs has posed a significant administrative problem.

2. Indicate the general concern evidenced by the pilot project coordinators for the indiscriminate awarding of c.e. units to short term (less

than one c.e. unit) programs, particularly those of a conference type (i.e., those with a series of speakers not coordinated by a single director or moderator).

3. Provide additional details, examples of applications and suggested operating procedures for those interested in initiating the application of c.e. units in their institutions.

B. The National Task Force is urged to contact professional associations and industry groups and, if possible, to obtain statements of acceptance or endorsement for the c.e. unit to the end that the user groups (students, societies and companies) will request the awarding of units to the educational programs in which they are involved at colleges and universities.

C. The National Task Force is urged to schedule regional orientation sessions on the c.e. unit during the summer and fall of 1971 for institutions, societies, companies, and governmental agencies involved in non-degree continuing education activities and interested in assessing the potential of the unit for their own operations.

RECOMMENDATION TO N.U.E.A.

An additional recommendation is made to NUEA to encourage its Divisions of Independent Study and Conferences and Institutes to develop a statement of policies on criteria and record-keeping for the c.e. unit.

RESOLUTION BY N.U.E.A.

The Conferences and Institutes Division of NUEA sponsored the resolution below which was later passed at the Annual Association Business Meeting as an official resolution of NUEA. This action, along with the enthusiasm of the C & I Division, should encourage several additional institutions to test the application of the c.e. unit during the coming year. The resolution reads:

BE IT RESOLVED, that the results of the pilot project to study the Continuing Education Unit be used as a basis for further study and recommendations for implementation by NUEA member institutions.

RELATED ACTIVITIES

1. As reported at Portland, the Oregon Academy of General Practice is now requiring continuing education as a condition for continued membership. Dr. Pennington reacted to the c.e. unit: "I think it offers a great deal when it actually comes time to put down on paper what has occurred in terms of continuing education."

2. As reported by William F. McCulloch, University of Missouri-Columbia, The Missouri Veterinarian Association will meet shortly to plug the c.e. unit into its continuing education program. It will also be presented to the National association for possible use at that level.

3. A motion was passed by the Eastern Division of the U.S. Chamber of

Commerce, Board of Regents to have that group explore the potential of relating c.e. units to their nation-wide institutes.

4. The University of Colorado is researching the possibility of using the c.e. unit for in-service training programs for teachers which are offered by the University but do not carry academic credit. Changed requirements for recertification of teachers can now be satisfied by in-service training.

5. A registered nurse in California is required to demonstrate that she has participated in a learning experience every two years to maintain her licensure. The c.e. unit is being investigated as a possible recording device.

6. Several articles have appeared during the past year to help disseminate the information about the c.e. unit. Note the bibliography below. The two most recent articles resulted in several requests to the NUEA Washington office for more information.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Continuing Education Unit: An Interim Statement of the National Task Force," 1970. Available from National University Extension Association, Suite 360, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036.

"The Continuing Education Unit," by Paul Grogan. The Personnel Administrator, September, 1970.

"Credit for Non-Credit?" Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 54-56. March-April, 1971.

"The Continuing Education Unit: A New Tool for Adult Educators," by Keith E. Glancy. Adult Leadership, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 10 ff. May, 1971.

Keith E. Glancy
The Johns Hopkins University
June, 1971

NATIONAL TASK FORCE ON THE CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT

Excerpts from Pilot Project Evaluation Reports

K.E.C.
6/24/71

HOW WAS THE UNIT ACCEPTED IN YOUR INSTITUTION?

It was a rather simple administrative procedure to award units.

Our staff have been most cooperative in trying to determine courses where c.e. units should be awarded.

Recommended that the c.e. unit be awarded when offering a "teaching" course.

Many favorable comments have been made by students in courses where the c.e. unit has been awarded.

The general institutional acceptance can be classified as "indifference."

If I had had more time to devote to developing enthusiasm . . .

Excellent by the central administration. Students expressed great interest.

The c.e. units would contribute to the achievement of the continuing education objectives of the university and should be adopted.

The c.e. unit was well accepted. Most felt the concept was necessary and long overdue.

Pilot Project was greeted with impressive silence.

WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE OR OPERATIONAL PROBLEMS DID YOU FACE?

Very few.

"One more form to complete," for several staff members.

I would see no difficulty in incorporating the c.e. units awarded into the system.

With planning we have had no particular problems. Our costs to date have been mainly those of printing and filing.

We shall be obliged to change certain aspects of our permanent record keeping.

Lack of interest in taking on additional paperwork.

University off-campus council established procedures. Major problems were monies to get the system into operation and acceptance of keeping the records by the Registrar.

The major operational problem was in acquiring social security numbers.

No problems were encountered in the implementation of a storage and retrieval system. For a large and active file of records the use of a computer system would be required.

The volume is enormous.

The establishment of a computerized record keeping and retrieval system.

WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THE CONTINUED AWARDING OF c.e. UNITS?

I would prefer to see the results of this pilot project before making such a recommendation.

We feel that the c.e. unit system is the best approach suggested so far. The c.e. unit should not be awarded promiscuously but should only be awarded in those programs which are of a "course" format and not to conference type programs.

Depending on the final outcome of the Task Force study.

Undecided.

Very strongly. The c.e. unit is a natural medium of exchange.

Yes. For those activities which meet the criteria of continuing education.
Yes. To all noncredit programs which have a minimum of 10 contact hours.
Yes. To all programs related to professional development or career progression.
We will continue awarding c.e. units. The other campuses will initiate this program next year.
Not in the way we did it. If we continued, it would probably be by developing a new course program for a new audience.
Very strongly recommend continued awarding of c.e. units.
I have grave doubts about doing it for non-credit (vis-a-vis non-degree credit) if the world of academia puts a "strangle hold" on the great flexibility we have today in the area of non-credit programs.

WHAT DEFICIENCIES DID YOU FIND IN THE STATEMENT OF PROCEDURES?

Current procedures are adequate. Individual institutions must have authority to make final decision on number of units awarded.
No particular deficiency. Need of more specific statements as guides to those who are beginning to come into the program and suggestions on operating mechanics.
None at this point.
Instructions are clear.
Each institution must develop its own operational procedures for applying and using c.e. units.
Classifying continuing education by level of a degree program is not realistic.

WHAT ADDITIONAL TESTING OR EVALUATION OF THE UNIT WOULD BE USEFUL?

Some schools will have to plunge ahead and award c.e. units. The idea will gain acceptance only through use.
More institutions need to participate in order to draw any generalizations.
The prime test is going to be a feedback from industry, government, etc. as to how they use these units for personnel records, etc.
I would simply like another year to get this activity going.
The usefulness of the c.e. unit can only be accurately evaluated if it is nationally promulgated.
The test should center on the value of the c.e. unit to the student and to his employer.
Concerned with continuing education for teachers and with companies who present many in-house training programs.

GIVE EXAMPLES OF PROGRAMS FOR WHICH c.e. UNITS WERE CONSIDERED BUT NOT AWARDED.

In most cases the committee would agree that if it were not definitely a "course" type program, they should not be awarded.
One-day conferences. Time duration is too short. The volume precludes this administratively.
Large lecture classes in which we do not keep attendance were rejected.

WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT JUDGEMENT OF THE POTENTIAL USEFULNESS OF THE UNIT?

The potential is great. There is a long way to go.
If there was widespread acceptance of this unit, there would be some benefits to its use.

The c.e. unit has great potential value when it is publicized and used widely.

I have hopes that a national system for the recognition of non-credit courses through the use of c.e. units will enhance the value of these courses in the eyes of business, industry, government, and even educators.

Limited potential.

Useful. Let's try it.

I am encountering people throughout the university and industrial community who feel that this approach has a tremendous amount of promise.

Unlimited, providing we stick with a basic framework and not assign c.e. units to every little event.

Useful to the individual who seeks recognition from his profession.

There must be intensive interaction with the professional societies and major industries.

The c.e. unit can be an important factor in the development of more effective continuing education programs throughout the country.

OTHER COMMENTS OR RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE NATIONAL TASK FORCE.

We have not devised a scheme which definitely indicates the true level of the instruction.

Recommend that a coordinators' meeting be held in Washington, D. C., summer or fall, 1971.

Secure professional societies' support for establishing "reward systems" for a cumulative number of c.e. units.

A widespread educational and promotional program of the c.e. unit must be effected if the potential is to be realized to an acceptable degree.

The National Task Force should develop plans for a uniform standard system of machine methods for recording and reporting c.e. units.

The development of the c.e. unit should continue.

Anything like c.e. units being established whereby a student merely registers would dissipate its value. It must represent satisfactory completion.

COMMENTS FROM OTHER SOURCES

The requirement of qualifying by full attendance at all sessions is perhaps the main administrative problem in using the c.e. units with conferences. It is not feasible to take attendance at large conferences. Clarification of the attendance requirement for conferences is needed.

Some minor criticism was expressed in regard to the use of social security numbers for identification purposes.

I believe NUEA should recommend that Divisions such as Correspondence and Conferences and Institutes attempt to standardize their policies on criteria and record-keeping.

Some special provisions will have to be made for reporting correspondence (independent study) courses. Similarly for instructional hours.

My concern is that the c.e. unit will be widely accepted as a meaningful quantitative measure which in fact will conceal inadvertently a good deal of variation in what the c.e. unit will presume to stand for.

I am far from persuaded there is a real need for any standard non-credit unit among the majority of persons. It is a fair question to ask whether in fact there is as widespread a demand for non-credit credit as the Task Force asserts.

COMMENTS FROM STUDENTS
(Excerpts from Survey Report submitted by Mrs. Murphy, University of New Hampshire)

Program should be retroactive to all non-credit courses.

I believe if you are going to set up a ceu system, give the individual a goal to achieve--better for the individual, better for the school.

. . . good as long as it doesn't cause a drastic rise in tuition.

I believe for the tuition and time involved there should be a credit system for all adult education courses, or any continuing educational courses.

My non-credit courses have had absolutely nothing to do with my profession, so I don't feel any evaluation is called for. . . . some sort of cumulative record should be kept.

. . . not because someone feels like throwing me some crumbs called ceu's!

I am more interested in course content than I am for any credit if they cannot be transferred to college credits.

I think the idea of c.e. units counting for college credits is a wonderful idea.

NATIONAL TASK FORCE ON THE CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT

Pilot Project Report

K.E.G.
6/24/71

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Institutions	No. of Reports	No. of Participants	Accumulated c.e. units
Univ. of Illinois	56	2,410	7,356.2
Indiana University	5	128	52.6
Univ. of Iowa	29	3,064	3,505.4
Univ. of Michigan	15	1,698	3,644.6
Univ. of Minnesota	11	263	358.1
Univ. of New Hampshire	36	805	1,256.2
North Carolina State Univ.	69	2,368	2,420.9
Rutgers University	179	5,379	12,580.6
Syracuse University	25	686	1,563.0
U.C.L.A.	156	9,892	14,816.2
Washington Univ. (St. Louis)	13	455	953.1
West Virginia University	9	1,137	1,875.5
University Center for Adult Education (Detroit)	15	256	354.0
	618	28,541	50,736.4

EQUIVALENT EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF INSTRUCTION

	Class	Intensive Course	Conference	Other	Total
Secondary	3			1	4
Junior College	143	26	7	3	179
Senior College	54	45	4	14	117
Post-Baccalaureate	101	83	26	1	211
Other	20	58	2	-	80
Not Recorded					27
					618

UNITS AWARDED

Ratio 1:10	568
Less than 1:10	40
More than 1:10	4
No Response	6

NUMBER QUALIFYING FOR c.e. UNITS

	Class	Intensive Course	Conference	Other	Total
100% of those enrolled	2,627	11,914	4,360	329	19,230
Less than 100%					
No. enrolled	4,828	3,414	979	90	9,311
No. Qualifying	3,851	2,243	701	75	6,870

TOTAL ACCUMULATED c.e. UNITS

	Class	Intensive Course	Conference	Other	Total
Participants Qualifying for Units	6,478	14,157	5,061	504	26,200
Total No. of Units	18,304.8	26,388.8	5,150.9	482.4	50,326.9
Aver. units per participant	2.87	1.83	1.02	.96	1.90

INSTRUCTIONAL HOURS

1 - 5		9	9		18
6 - 10	9	39	14	4	66
11 - 15	14	62	18	4	98
16 - 20	38	23	2	10	73
21 - 25	81	9		1	91
26 - 30	77	47			124
31 - 35	40	13	1		54
36 - 40	52	10	1		63
41 - 45	7	2			9
46 - 50	1	7			8
51 - 75	2	2			4
76 - 100	1	6			7
Over 100		3			3

INITIAL PROGRAM ENROLLMENT

0 - 10	30	10		2	42
11 - 20	151	63	1	9	224
21 - 30	106	47	1	4	158
31 - 40	31	25	2	3	61
41 - 50	8	22	2	1	33
51 - 75	2	19	4		25
76 - 100		10	9		19
101 - 125	2	7	5		14
126 - 150		4	1		5
151 - 175		5	2		7
176 - 200		3	4		7
201 - 300		6	6		12
301 - 400		3	2		5
401 - 500	1	2			3
Over 500		3			3
	331	229	39	19	618

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND EXPECTED (Relative to Level of Instruction)

Higher Level Expected	10
Equivalent Level Expected	299
Lower Level Expected	71

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND EXPECTED (by level stated)

None stated	138
10th Grade	3
High School	202
Specified Experience	15
Specified Subject Matter Background	22
Associate Degree	6
Baccalaureate Degree	80
Baccalaureate Degree and Specified Experience	8
Baccalaureate Degree and Specified Subject Matter Background	35
Master's Degree	1
Professional Degree	37

PROGRAM DIRECTION

	Class	Intensive Course	Conference	Other	Total
Different Director and Instructor	317	183	19	18	537
Same Director and Instructor	5	31	2		38
No Instructor specified		15	18		33
Information not given					10

NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTORS INVOLVED

No additional Instructors	290	131		15	436
One to Two	20	28	3	1	52
Three to Five	8	29	8	1	46
Five to Nine	7	23	12	2	44
Ten or more	5	16	15		36
Not given					4

ADDITIONAL TIMES ACTIVITIES WILL BE OFFERED

Number of different programs	133
Total number of sessions scheduled	268
Estimated additional attendance	7,725

COOPERATING OR COSPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS

Prof. or Tech. Societies	7	37	6		50
Business-Industrial Assns.	5	14	6		25
Specific Companies	8	18			26
Unions			1		1
Government (incl. schools)	17	21	9		47
Cultural and non-profit	3	9	2	1	15